



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/730,031	12/09/2003	Toshiharu Oishi	107156-00216	3017

7590	07/03/2007
------	------------

ARENT FOX KINTNER PLOTKIN & KAHN, PLLC
Suite 600
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036-5339

EXAMINER	
PATEL, VIP	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2879	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/03/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/730,031

Applicant(s)

OISHI ET AL.

Examiner

Vip Patel

Art Unit

2879

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 3-5, 7, 9-20, 23 and 24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 15 and 17 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3-5, 7, 9-14, 16, 18-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 3-5, 7, 20, and 23, 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nakano et al. (US 2004/0232813).

Regarding claims 23 and 24, Nakano discloses a flat panel device (see figure 7) comprising a PDP unit and a protective sheet (optical filter) formed on the PDP unit. The protective sheet (optical filter) further includes laminated mutually adjoining and in order from the PDP, an electromagnetic-wave blocking layer (2), an infrared-radiation absorbing and color-tone correcting layer (6 and 7), and a light antireflection layer (9). The layers are bonded to the PDP by means of a transparent adhesive layer (3). (Paragraphs 0343-0348). Further, the EM wave blocking layer would necessarily provide some heat relaxation to the layers it is supporting by nature of its heat conductivity and composition. Nakano also discloses adhesives with an adhesive strength less than 3 Kgf/inch. (Paragraph 0316)

Regarding claim 3, Nakano further discloses the use of an acrylic adhesive layer. (Paragraph 0312).

Regarding claims 4, 5 and 20, Nakano further discloses the use of adhesives which have an index of refraction of approximately 1.5. This is substantially equal to the glass substrate of the PDP. (Paragraph 0312)

Regarding claim 7, Nakano further discloses the filter layer has a thickness of greater than 0.5mm. (Paragraph 0265)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2879

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains~ Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 16, 18, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakano et al. (US 2004/0232813) in view of Yoshikawa et al. (US 6,255,778).

Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakano et al. (US 2004/0232813) in view of Wachi et al. (US 2003/0085649 A1).

Regarding claims 9-11, Nakano discloses the device as claimed but does not appear to specify the use of recesses formed in the infrared-radiation absorbing layer and the antireflection film in order to expose a side portion of the EM wave-blocking layer forming an earth connecting part. However, Wachi discloses (see figure 2) a fiat panel device including a PDP unit (2) and a protective sheet formed on the PDP unit where the EM-wave blocking layer has an area larger than the other two filter layers. This results in a recess formed in the top two layers above the exposed EM-wave blocking layer. Further the EM-wave blocking layer is grounded at this location. (See figure 2). The recess advantageously provides for a more efficient contact.

Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakano et al. (US 2004/0232813) in view of Wachi et al. (US 2003/0085649 A1) and further in view of Yasunori et al. (US 6,417,619).

Regarding claims 12-14, Nakano in view of Wachi discloses the device as claimed (see rejection of claim 9 above) but does not appear to specify the use of a dark coloring on the conductive mesh, however Yasunori, in the same field of endeavor, discloses the use of darkening the conductive mesh of an EM-wave blocking layer for a PDP in order to advantageously improve contrast by reducing flicker or glare. (Column 8 lines 40-45). Thus, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skills in the art to incorporate the black coloring on the conductive mesh as taught by Yasunori into the device as disclosed by Nakano in view of Wachi in order to advantageously improve contrast by reducing flicker or glare.

Claims 16, 18, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakano et al. (US 2004/0232813) in view of Yoshikawa et al. (US 6,255,778).

Regarding claims 16, 18, and 19, Nakano discloses the device as claimed but does not appear to specify the use of a chassis member in contact with the EM wave-blocking layer. However, Yoshikawa, in the same field of endeavor, discloses (see figure 1) a fiat panel device including a PDP unit and a chassis member (7) that interpositions an

Art Unit: 2879

adhesive member that is optionally made from foam polymer. (Column 6 lines 51-61). The chassis member is included around all edges of the filter and holds the filter against the front of the PDP. (Column 6 lines 21-27). Yoshikawa further discloses the use of a conductive rubber seal material between the chassis and the electromagnetic-wave blocking layer. (Column 6 lines 30-35). The use of a chassis member attached to the PDP advantageously reduces shock while ensuring strong adhesion of the filter layer to the PDP. Thus, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skills in the art to incorporate the chassis member in contact with the EM wave-blocking layer as taught by Yoshikawa into the device as disclosed by Nakano in order to advantageously reduce shock while ensuring strong adhesion Of the filter layer to the PDP.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's filed arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for following reasons. Applicant reasons that independent claim 23 recites transparent adhesive material having adhesive strength of 3 kgf/inch or less when being vertically detached. Applicant states that "Generally, when a film having relatively thin thickness, for example 30-micromel thick polyester film, is peeled in a direction 180°, the power to peel the film acts on t peeled linear portion of the film. Therefore, the power to peel becomes a relatively sm value, for example 30 g/cm (= 0.762 kgf/inch)". Examiner would like to point out that the derived 0.762 kgf/inch meets the claimed limitation of 3 kgf/inch or less.

Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2879

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vip Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-2458. The examiner can normally be reached on 5.30am- 2pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimesh Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

**/Vip Patel/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2879**